

IN THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): Meyer et al.

Confirmation No.: 8127

Application No.: 10/661,433

Examiner: Prasad, Chandrika

Filing Date: 09/12/2003

Group Art Unit: 2839

Title: CIRCUIT BOARD ASSEMBLY

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL LETTER FOR RESPONSE/AMENDMENT

Sir:

Transmitted herewith is/are the following in the above-identified application:

- (X) Response/Amendment () Petition to extend time to respond
() New fee as calculated below () Supplemental Declaration
(X) No additional fee
() Other: _____ (fee \$ _____)

CLAIMS AS AMENDED BY OTHER THAN A SMALL ENTITY						
(1) FOR	(2) CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT	(3) NUMBER EXTRA	(4) HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	(5) PRESENT EXTRA	(6) RATE	(7) ADDITIONAL FEES
TOTAL CLAIMS		MINUS		= 0	X \$50	\$ 0
INDEP. CLAIMS		MINUS		= 0	X \$200	\$ 0
[] FIRST PRESENTATION OF A MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM					+ \$360	\$ 0
EXTENSION FEE	1ST MONTH \$120.00	2ND MONTH \$450.00	3RD MONTH \$1020.00	4TH MONTH \$1590.00		\$ 0
OTHER FEES						\$
TOTAL ADDITIONAL FEE FOR THIS AMENDMENT						\$ 0

Charge \$ 0 to Deposit Account 08-2025. At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.25. Additionally please charge any fees to Deposit Account 08-2025 under 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Respectfully submitted,

Meyer et al.

By

Todd A. Rathe

Todd A. Rathe

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Reg. No. 38,276

Date: 10/27/2005

Date of Deposit: 10/27/2005

Typed Name: Catherine A. Cusick

Signature:

Catherine A. Cusick

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Meyer et al.

Title: CIRCUIT BOARD ASSEMBLY

Appl. No.: 10/661,433

Filing Date: 9/12/2003

Examiner: Prasad, Chandrika

Art Unit: 2839



<p>CERTIFICATE OF MAILING</p> <p>I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date below.</p> <p>Catherine A. Cusick (Printed Name)</p> <p><i>Catherine A. Cusick</i> (Signature)</p> <p>10/27/05 (Date of Deposit)</p>
--

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed on September 27, 2005, in which restriction requirements were imposed.

I. Distinct Inventions Restriction

Paragraph 1 of the Office Action asserted that that the Application includes claims directed to two distinct inventions:

Invention I - Claims 1-38, drawn to a circuit board assembly; and

Invention II – Claims 39, drawn to a computing system.

In response, Applicants elect, with traverse, Invention I: Claims 1-38, drawn to a circuit board assembly.

Applicants hereby traverse the restriction requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 121 as to Inventions I and II. As correctly noted on page 2 of the office action, “Inventions I and II are related as combination/subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability.” Applicants respectfully submit that this requirement for imposing a combination/subcombination restriction as to Inventions I and II

is not met. In particular, the innovative features recited in Claim 1 are identical to the innovative features recited in Claim 39. In particular, Claim 1 recites the same first connector portion, second connector portion, first alignment member and second alignment member as recited in Claim 39. Thus, the restriction requirement imposed is not justified and should be withdrawn.

II. Species Restriction

Page 4 of the Office Action further asserted that the Application is directed to four patentably distinct species:

Embodiment 1: FIGURES 1-2;

Embodiment 2: FIGURE 3;

Embodiment 3: FIGURES 4-9; and

Embodiment 4: FIGURE 10.

The Office Action requested that Applicants elect a singled disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claim shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held allowable. The Office Action further asserted that there appears to be no generic claim.

With this response, Applicants hereby elect Embodiment 3, FIGURES 4-9, for prosecution on the merits. Claims 1-10, 12-26, 28-33 and 35-38 read upon Embodiment 3, FIGURES 4-9. Applicants further note that Claim 39 also reads upon Embodiment 3, FIGURES 4-9. Of those claims that read upon Embodiment 3, FIGURES 4-9, Claims 1-2, 4, 8-9, 12-14 and 35-38 are generic to each of Embodiments 1-4. Upon allowance of such generic claims, Applicants respectfully request reinstatement of those claims that do not specifically read upon Embodiment 3.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

October 27, 2005

By

Todd A. Rathe

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

Customer Number: 22879

Telephone: (414) 297-5710

Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Todd A. Rathe

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 38,276